

Transcript

00:00:03 Speaker 1

Welcome to After the End from the Ethoc Centre at the University of Oxford, funded by the Wellcome Discovery Award Scheme.

00:00:11 Speaker 1

I'm Patricia Kingori, Professor of Global Health Ethics at the University of Oxford.

00:00:16 Speaker 1

In this series, we explore endings and their aftermaths.

00:00:20 Speaker 1

Who decides when an end has been reached, whether the end for one person is the end for everybody, and what happens after these so-called endings?

00:00:29 Speaker 1

Today, I'm with Patricia Daly, Professor of the Human Geography of Africa at the University of Oxford, and lawyer Ricardo Labianco, International Policy Manager at the Mines Advisory Group MAG.

00:00:41 Speaker 1

We explore when and if genocide can end in Burundi, and how, even when active hostilities are over, the civilian population usually remains at risk from unexploded remnants of war, such as landmines.

00:00:56 Speaker 2

My name is Patricia Daly.

00:00:58 Speaker 2

I am Professor of the Human Geography of Africa in the School of Geography and the Environment at the University of Oxford.

00:01:06 Speaker 2

At the workshop, I spoke mainly about my research on political violence and war and peace in Central Africa, and in particular the state of Burundi.

00:01:18 Speaker 2

For many years now, I've been interested in forced displacement, refugees, the possibilities and opportunities for refugees to return back to their countries of origin, and also the modalities of peace.

00:01:31 Speaker 2

When can we say war ends and peace begins?

00:01:36 Speaker 2

This is not something that is new within the academy, because scholars from the 1960s onwards has talked about the differences between positive and negative peace.

00:01:47 Speaker 2

Negative

00:01:48 Speaker 2

Peace, according to Johann Galtung, who came up with the concept, is when war ends, when the fighting ends, but the structural conditions that caused the fighting in the 1st place remain.

00:02:02 Speaker 2

He says most peace, in fact, that we understand or see is negative peace.

00:02:07 Speaker 2

And then positive peace is when the fighting ends or the war ends and the conditions that caused the violence in the 1st place are also addressed and end.

00:02:20 Speaker 2

And we have people being able to restart their lives in a context of calm.

00:02:27 Speaker 1

Thank you so much, Patricia, and I love you introducing these different ideas of peace.

00:02:32 Speaker 1

I would love to speak more about that because while it's very well known in your discipline,

00:02:37 Speaker 1

this idea of positive and negative peace, I don't think it's something that many people might be familiar with.

00:02:44 Speaker 1

And it felt very much to resonate with this concept of after the end, this idea that while there's peace, there is this underlying threat, underlying violence to that peace.

00:02:57 Speaker 1

And I felt that very much resonated with your work, Ricardo, looking specifically at the world of humanitarian disarmament and thinking around what does it mean for

00:03:07 Speaker 1

former conflict area to be described as mine-free.

00:03:12 Speaker 3

Thank you, Patricia.

00:03:14 Speaker 3

In the sector of humanitarian disarmament, we can identify at least two main goals.

00:03:20 Speaker 3

On the one hand, preventing the use of inhumane weapons or weapons that have a long and indiscriminating impact on civilians.

00:03:32 Speaker 3

This comes with the idea that even in the darkest time of conflict, there is always a way to think about what's going to happen at the end of that conflict and be sure that what the belligerent parties are doing during the conflict does not contaminate what's going to happen next.

00:03:52 Speaker 3

The other goal of humanitarian disarmament, and especially humanitarian mine action operations like the one carried out by the organization for which I work, MAG, is to address those long-term effects that inevitably remain once active hostilities end.

00:04:10 Speaker 3

We remain with areas that in our vernacular we refer to as contaminated by explosive ordinance, which is an umbrella term that covers all the active explosive that remains.

00:04:24 Speaker 3

And because it failed to detonate, it can detonate suddenly.

00:04:28 Speaker 3

And that requires a lot of work of identification of those explosive ordinance and minimization of the risk.

00:04:35 Speaker 3

As you can imagine, this clashes with the idea of end that the population can have.

00:04:42 Speaker 3

They might think that because the violence has ended, it might seem safer to go out, to go to school, to go to hospitals, to procure food and cultivate farming, but the danger remains and it actually might sometimes even cause higher casualties because of the lack of knowledge of those risks and the false idea.

00:05:05 Speaker 3

that violence has ended or the lack of knowledge that we have a different type of violence despite the end of the active hostilities.

00:05:15 Speaker 1

Thank you.

00:05:15 Speaker 1

Patricia, I think one of the great things about your work is that it really forces people to pay attention to areas where there have been peace declarations or a sense that something has ended.

00:05:28 Speaker 1

I want to go back and look at those places, after we were actually encouraged to think that those places have gone back to quote unquote normal.

00:05:37 Speaker 1

So I'd love to hear more, and you spoke very passionately about some of the gender dimensions as well.

00:05:43 Speaker 2

Yes, I suppose we can see peace occurring at different levels, spatial levels.

00:05:49 Speaker 2

Geographers will use this term spatial.

00:05:51 Speaker 2

At the level of the state,

00:05:54 Speaker 2

The peace agreements are normally negotiated and signed between the warring factions, especially in the context of civil war.

00:06:02 Speaker 2

And then afterwards, that peace agreement will include certain conditions that will be put in place in those countries.

00:06:10 Speaker 2

It might have political dimensions.

00:06:12 Speaker 2

So recent years, we've had power sharing between the belligerents.

00:06:17 Speaker 2

They might have economic dimensions or other dimensions about transforming but also stabilizing the state.

00:06:25 Speaker 2

The issue, of course, is that the negotiations and the signing of the peace agreements often take place in another country because citizens are often not involved in deciding or thinking about or in the conversations about what the nature of the post-conflict state might be.

00:06:42 Speaker 2

What you tend to have is an agreement that's imposed on a population.

00:06:46 Speaker 2

And that

00:06:47 Speaker 2

often means that at the local level, there's very little reconciliation.

00:06:52 Speaker 2

Since, I suppose, 1994, and the peace agreement in South Africa, where there was a peace and reconciliation process, that process has been adopted in other peace agreements.

00:07:03 Speaker 2

But in fact, often there's been very little reconciliation at the local level.

00:07:08 Speaker 2

And also, the economic conditions that are put in place with peace negotiations are what we call neoliberal ones.

00:07:13 Speaker 2

So they are about cutting back on services.

00:07:15 Speaker 2

So you can imagine as a

00:07:17 Speaker 2

has gone through a war where health, education, services, et cetera, have been disrupted.

00:07:22 Speaker 2

And then you have the imposition of neoliberal policies, which is about state retreat.

00:07:26 Speaker 2

And so this cutback of services really affect people intensely.

00:07:30 Speaker 2

So families who are coming out of war are suddenly expected to pay hospital fees or school fees and so on.

00:07:36 Speaker 2

It's almost, I think, a form of violence.

00:07:39 Speaker 2

The other thing that I've been aware of in my research is the rise of sexual violence after peace agreements have been signed.

00:07:47 Speaker 2

We tend to focus, and the international community focus, on sexual violence during war, because that's easier to deal with, I think, than actually the violence that pervades a society when rebels and military men go back to communities, even their own villages, with weapons if they're not properly disarmed, and will carry out acts of sexual violence.

00:08:09 Speaker 2

So when I did my research in Burundi, we found that most of the young people who were raped, they knew who they were raped by, and this was done

00:08:17 Speaker 2

after the so-called peace agreement had been signed and peace was supposed to be in place in these countries.

00:08:23 Speaker 2

So we need to unpack what we mean by violence.

00:08:26 Speaker 2

There's violence at the political level.

00:08:28 Speaker 2

Obviously, this is not something new.

00:08:30 Speaker 2

Scholars have been debating different forms of violence for some time.

00:08:34 Speaker 2

But often when we think of peace, we think of the absence of violence.

00:08:37 Speaker 2

And that's why Ricardo's point is important.

00:08:40 Speaker 2

It's a form of violence if you're not able to cultivate your farmland.

00:08:44 Speaker 2

Because then how do you survive?

00:08:46 Speaker 2

It's a form of violence.

00:08:47 Speaker 2

violence if you're not able to get your access back to your land, which some people find when they return to their villages and so on, their land has already been taken by elites or politicians or someone else.

00:09:00 Speaker 2

And then they have to, if they have the resources, go to courts.

00:09:03 Speaker 2

And even in the courts, they fail to gain access back to their land.

00:09:07 Speaker 2

And that contributes to the endemic poverty, aggravates social inequalities and anxieties, and of course, grievances.

00:09:15 Speaker 2

making the potential for the restart of the war, the restart of conflict even greater.

00:09:21 Speaker 1

That's such a great point.

00:09:22 Speaker 1

History is littered with so many examples of the way in which this plays out.

00:09:27 Speaker 1

If we don't take these different registers of violence seriously, it acts as a hotbed for further conflict in the future.

00:09:36 Speaker 1

I'm really struck, as I'm listening to both of you talk, how so much of what happens, at least at the national and international level, is really geared towards positive news stories.

00:09:50 Speaker 1

People need to feel that there have been successes and that their intervention has worked somehow.

00:09:57 Speaker 1

And I think part of the difficulty in what we're talking about is that we're saying, well, you have to engage with some of these complexities and the nuances, and the thing that you think you're doing isn't necessarily a straightforward success.

00:10:11 Speaker 1

So I'm really interested in this idea, particularly in relation to some of the things that you've spoken about, Ricardo, when you talk about examples such as Zambia and this notion of a place being mind-free.

00:10:25 Speaker 3

Yes, sure.

00:10:26 Speaker 3

An important aspect of humanitarian disarmament is the process that led to the adoption of the Mine Ban Treaty, also known as the Ottawa Convention, that bans at the international level the EU's production, stockpiling and transferring of anti-personal landmines.

00:10:45 Speaker 3

One of the important achievements of that process is that for the first time, civil society at different levels was involved in a discussion regarding weapons, because until the 90s, civil society was not considered to be a relevant actor in the sector dealing with weapons and disarmament.

00:11:05 Speaker 3

This also came with the fact that there was an emphasis on what we call human security rather than national security.

00:11:12 Speaker 3

So what are the sources of a state of insecurity, fear, and all other conditions that can lead to violence?

00:11:21 Speaker 3

Why I'm saying this is because this brought also the important step

00:11:27 Speaker 3

of developing what now we call humanitarian mine action that is different from what others call demining in the sense that it takes into account the needs and the views of the population on the ground.

00:11:41 Speaker 3

So asking and especially listening to people, on the one hand, it produces more effectiveness,

00:11:49 Speaker 3

because local people are the ones that are aware of where explosive ordinances are because of their own lived experience.

00:11:55 Speaker 3

It's much less free from explosive ordinance than we think at the international level.

00:12:01 Speaker 3

So it's extremely necessary in my work.

00:12:04 Speaker 3

I work constantly with my colleagues on the ground to make sure that what they record, what they listen from the communities, is actually brought to the international forum.

00:12:15 Speaker 3

The way in which weaponry or disarmament law is designed is this general idea that there is actually a limitation on what we call in international legal terms means and methods of warfare.

00:12:29 Speaker 3

States are not free to choose whatever weapon they think will bring victory, and this is a well-rooted principle, at least in theory and then in practice, unfortunately, we see that there are different ideas in that regard.

00:12:43 Speaker 3

This is to say that there is this principle, but then we need to work technology by technology to make the case of why that technology has a disproportionate impact on civilians, on people's lives and livelihoods, and why we call for a total ban.

00:13:01 Speaker 3

This was successful when it came to anti-personal landmines.

00:13:05 Speaker 3

So the states that are affected by the presence of anti-personal landmines can at a certain point become free and declared free from anti-personal landmines.

00:13:15 Speaker 3

It was an important political aspiration and it was done with the idea of encouraging states to work together and put all their expertise and resources to get rid of remaining anti-personal landmines.

00:13:30 Speaker 3

The reality though is that we need to accept that unfortunately explosive ordinal contamination remains, what we call in the sector residual contamination, residual risk.

00:13:44 Speaker 3

because as many efforts as we can put in the work that especially my colleagues on the ground do, there is always a residual risk.

00:13:53 Speaker 3

It's not unusual even for European states to find unexploded ordinance in foundations of buildings or below squares as a legacy of the Second World War, mainly, and they require interventions to be deactivated and removed.

00:14:09 Speaker 3

And so we go back to the idea that we work to address the risk and create a mind-free world, but we need to accept that residual risk exists, and it's better to be prepared and better to have states that have the capacity to identify the needs and address the risk promptly, rather than being caught by surprise with a higher loss of lives and life-changing injuries.

00:14:37 Speaker 1

Thank you so much.

00:14:38 Speaker 1

You've covered so much ground in that response, and I'd love to pick up on one of the points that you've made and hear what Patricia thinks of it.

00:14:44 Speaker 1

You've spoken about this idea of residual risk and residual contamination in the sense of a very physical risk.

00:14:53 Speaker 1

I'm really interested in this idea of residual psychological risk, Patricia, the things that are not necessarily seen and that people carry with them after these conflicts have been declared over.

00:15:06 Speaker 2

I think that's a really good point.

00:15:07 Speaker 2

I'm not a psychologist, so I can't speak about this with any degree of authority, but I follow refugee communities.

00:15:16 Speaker 2

I've worked in so-called post-conflict communities where it's quite clear that people are traumatized.

00:15:24 Speaker 2

People who have been displaced from their homes, even when they return, find it difficult to so-called reintegrate because the conditions have changed normally in a place that has undergone warfare.

00:15:35 Speaker 2

As Ricardo said, they might not have access to certain services and facilities that they had before.

00:15:42 Speaker 2

But with refugees, even second or third generation brought up in other countries than their parents or grandparents,

00:15:51 Speaker 2

There's this sort of intergenerational transfer of, I suppose, harm or violence or fear.

00:15:58 Speaker 2

If they're able to return and reconnect, it helps.

00:16:02 Speaker 2

But in some cases where people have been persecuted and you have authoritarian regimes, people don't go back.

00:16:08 Speaker 2

They are terrified.

00:16:10 Speaker 2

and meet young, say, Burundians in Dar es Salaam in Tanzania who tried to hide their Burundian identity or their Hutu identity, because Hutus were affected by genocide in the 1970s in Burundi.

00:16:23 Speaker 2

Many of the first Burundian refugees were Hutus.

00:16:26 Speaker 2

And then in 1994, Rwandan genocide, the Hutus were the perpetrators, different Hutus, but still Hutus in another country.

00:16:35 Speaker 2

And so Hutus are labeled violent people.

00:16:39 Speaker 2

So many of the younger generation are trying to transcend that identity of being violent people.

00:16:46 Speaker 2

There's one group in Tanzania who wanted to change the name of their ethnic group from Hutu to Higwa.

00:16:53 Speaker 2

Higwa in Kurundi means lucky people.

00:16:55 Speaker 2

And they say they're lucky to have escaped, and that's why they want to use that term.

00:16:59 Speaker 2

But of course, the Tanzania state was not saying, nah, we're not going to allow you to change your ethnic name.

00:17:04 Speaker 2

This was a way of this second or third generation transcending their past and that history of violence.

00:17:10 Speaker 2

So it continues.

00:17:11 Speaker 2

And people will still say, where's your home?

00:17:14 Speaker 2

Where are you from?

00:17:16 Speaker 2

In Tanzania, most refugees are black.

00:17:18 Speaker 2

They look very similar to Tanzanian, but there's subtle differences.

00:17:21 Speaker 2

And so people are constantly trying to suppress those differences in order to integrate into Tanzanian society.

00:17:28 Speaker 2

But then the trauma is still there.

00:17:30 Speaker 2

I think it takes generations, actually, for people to feel differently about place and the place that their families have come from, especially if that migration was caused by trauma, by violence.

00:17:45 Speaker 2

I just want to say something about also the peace, because the UN, I think, in recent years has accepted that you're not going to have positive peace.

00:17:55 Speaker 2

And so what they've promoted has been what's been described as stabilization.

00:18:00 Speaker 2

which means have some sense of national security, but not much in terms of transforming those states to make conditions better for local people.

00:18:10 Speaker 2

So what scholars like myself have been advocating, I would say probably for the last 10 years or more, is a recognition of the need to promote what we call a local peace.

00:18:20 Speaker 2

How do we localize peace?

00:18:22 Speaker 2

How do we move it away for those international and national arenas to the place where people have to mix with each other?

00:18:29 Speaker 2

And if you go into communities, there have been some really interesting discussions and I think observations about how people treat people who have been violent.

00:18:39 Speaker 2

So if somebody is from your community and they've been a rebel and it's known that they've killed lots of people, you think they'll go back to their community and be integrated?

00:18:49 Speaker 2

We would be terrified of somebody coming in.

00:18:52 Speaker 2

And so

00:18:52 Speaker 2

So it's the same in those communities.

00:18:54 Speaker 2

They're terrified.

00:18:55 Speaker 2

And if that person still has a weapon, I know in northern Uganda, there have been studies about how the community carry out various ceremonies and so on to cleanse the person who have committed atrocities in order for them to become a full member of the community again.

00:19:12 Speaker 2

So it's not just at the national, state level, it's about how do we build up those relationships, interpersonal relationships between community members in order for people to feel secure in those communities.

00:19:24 Speaker 1

I'm really interested in so much of what you've said, and you've led it into the next question I was going to ask, which is thinking about who should say when something has ended.

00:19:34 Speaker 1

I'd be really interested in both of your responses to that question, given that you've made it really clear that the end is complicated.

00:19:42 Speaker 1

Ricardo, do you want to go first?

00:19:44 Speaker 3

Yes, because I also take the opportunity to add another example of Patricia's first point, this idea of the lived experience of the conflict and doubt that is dragged even beyond the peace agreement throughout the generations.

00:20:00 Speaker 3

We have many examples of that kind, even when it comes to explosive ordinance.

00:20:05 Speaker 3

I had the opportunity of interviewing a group of people and communities in different parts of Lebanon in 2023.

00:20:13 Speaker 3

My research at the time was about food security and mine action, but it was inevitable to end up in questions about how those people cope and adapt to the presence of explosive ordinance.

00:20:27 Speaker 3

I received a lot of interesting answers that gave clear evidence of the fact that the explosive ordinance became...

00:20:35 Speaker 3

becomes part of the life of that person.

00:20:37 Speaker 3

It's always in their mind.

00:20:39 Speaker 3

I remember, for example, some people replying to me that in the community there was always this sense of sad expectation that hearing explosions or having their sons and daughters going in the field as a shepherd, they might not come back.

00:20:54 Speaker 3

This idea that when you hear that someone had an accident, it could be one of your relatives or one of your sons or daughters, at the same time,

00:21:05 Speaker 3

with passing of the time, you also hear how these people adapt.

00:21:11 Speaker 3

The presence of explosive ordinance belongs to their everyday life.

00:21:15 Speaker 3

It remains a source of danger, it remains a risk, but it's something they know how to navigate.

00:21:21 Speaker 3

Then to answer your question about who decides what should be the end, my first instinctive answer would be the affected people.

00:21:31 Speaker 3

Once we identify what is the source of the problem of the violence, the last word should be the communities.

00:21:38 Speaker 3

And as a first step, those communities need to be listened and need to be asked, because sometimes there can be a misalignment of what we think is our end, what is their end.

00:21:48 Speaker 3

In some cases, they might not even wish for an end because they say, we adapted so much, we don't necessarily see the need.

00:21:57 Speaker 3

I want to close my answer by saying that when we want to connect international policy, international affairs and law with what happens on the ground, it's more frequent to see misalignments of what we think is peace or the end of the hostilities.

00:22:13 Speaker 3

At the same time, I don't see that these two levels are necessarily against each other.

00:22:18 Speaker 3

There can be alignment and it requires a lot of effort, but we do have interesting examples of how the needs and the view of the earth communities ended up reaching the international level and shaped in some form processes.

00:22:33 Speaker 3

The Convention that bans the use of cluster munitions is an example of a treaty that is working actually

00:22:40 Speaker 3

on the legs, often the prosthetic legs, of survivors willing to engage with that forum and bring their own lived experience.

00:22:48 Speaker 1

Thank you so much.

00:22:49 Speaker 1

I wanted also to give Patricia the opportunity to speak to this question of who should decide when something has ended.

00:22:56 Speaker 2

I think it's difficult to say who.

00:22:59 Speaker 2

Obviously, I do agree with Ricardo.

00:23:02 Speaker 2

I think it should be the affected communities.

00:23:06 Speaker 2

I don't think there is a fixed point that constitutes an end.

00:23:11 Speaker 2

I think ending something is a process that might take generations.

00:23:17 Speaker 2

And we have to look at that process with stages or milestones that will say, okay, this has been achieved, therefore we can move on to the next, or these are the things that we need to achieve in order for people to live, I would say, livable lives, to have their humanity recognized

00:23:36 Speaker 2

within a community for them to be safe, secure, and have a high level of well-being.

00:23:42 Speaker 2

So we need to identify what constitutes peace or what the conditions for long-term peace would look like, and then have a process whereby those things can be delivered.

00:23:54 Speaker 2

So if you think about communities that have undergone war, everything is disrupted.

00:23:59 Speaker 2

So putting in place those structures that will enable them to have education, access education,

00:24:06 Speaker 2

Schools are so important because displaced people are thinking about the future and providing better futures for their children.

00:24:12 Speaker 2

So schools, health services, all those basic things have to be in place.

00:24:18 Speaker 2

Personal security, access to land, employment.

00:24:21 Speaker 2

If we think about how Germany and Europe was reconstructed after the Second World War, that sort of process should go on in many of these countries where I've been doing research, and yet they don't.

00:24:33 Speaker 2

They use the term reconstruction, but it's never been that.

00:24:36 Speaker 2

at that level to really improve people's lives.

00:24:39 Speaker 2

And so when it comes to who, yes, it should be the community, but it could be also a mixture of people at different levels.

00:24:48 Speaker 2

But certainly the community needs to be involved because their conditions for survival will change.

00:24:56 Speaker 2

And also, as Ricardo said, people will change what they want.

00:25:00 Speaker 2

And that is okay also.

00:25:02 Speaker 2

We all change.

00:25:04 Speaker 2

So allowing for some sort of change in the process about what the end might look like is really important.

00:25:12 Speaker 2

A family might say, actually, we've always wanted to move to the city and that's our end goal.

00:25:17 Speaker 2

We don't want to stay on the land because the mines and so on.

00:25:21 Speaker 2

But having the opportunity to do that in a very secure way is also a good thing.

00:25:27 Speaker 2

So I just think it's a complex process, but it can be mapped out in terms of various stages.

00:25:35 Speaker 2

and a number of actors can be involved.

00:25:37 Speaker 2

But it can't just be the international community, because most of us, and include myself, at the international level, have very little clue of what it's like to actually live and survive in a war-torn country.

00:25:51 Speaker 2

And that's why, in some sense, many of us in the West are so hostile towards refugees, because it's a long time, it's decades since we have experienced what it means to live in a war-torn country.

00:26:02 Speaker 1

I think that's such a good point.

00:26:04 Speaker 1

what people want and being given space to live the lives that they want to live is an important marker of what peace looks like, but also, in many respects, the end or the beginning of a never phase of their life.

00:26:18 Speaker 1

One of the great things, I think, in both of your work is that in paying attention to after the end,

00:26:25 Speaker 1

You've drawn attention to some of the things that we don't see and that are made invisible by these state and international level declarations of peace.

00:26:36 Speaker 1

We don't go back and have a look at what's it like to live with negative peace.

00:26:42 Speaker 1

But in both of your conversations, you've actually touched on something which I think is very important, that's often missed as well, which is all of the ways in which people adapt and are resilient after these endings and make a life after these endings.

00:26:59 Speaker 1

Patricia, I was particularly interested in this community level ideas of cleansing as a way to make sense of life after the end.

00:27:09 Speaker 1

So I would love to hear a little bit more from you about some of the ways in which people adapt, overcome and are resilient after the end that often we just don't see.

00:27:20 Speaker 2

I'm not particularly comfortable with the concept of resilience and people being resilient, because if we just focus on resilience, it suggests that, oh, these people can endure.

00:27:32 Speaker 2

It's like, oh, yeah, Africans can endure more extreme levels of poverty.

00:27:37 Speaker 2

Most of the time, it's not okay.

00:27:38 Speaker 2

And that's what Galtung was saying.

00:27:41 Speaker 2

If, for example, we have the facilities to make people's lives better in all sorts of ways,

00:27:47 Speaker 2

and we don't do that, then there is a problem.

00:27:49 Speaker 2

That is structural violence.

00:27:51 Speaker 2

And so resilience means being able to endure structural violence, which tends to be a consequence of war.

00:27:59 Speaker 2

I would want the people whom I've studied not to be resilient in that sense, not to endure.

00:28:05 Speaker 2

I want them to have access to all those things that they should have access to as a human right.

00:28:11 Speaker 2

So because of that, I don't want to talk often about resilience, because when you hear the stories of people and what they've gone through, I mean, I examined the PhD by Yolanda Weimer.

00:28:22 Speaker 2

She studied Burundian refugees who'd been buffeted across borders, mainly women, for decades.

00:28:28 Speaker 2

They were in Tanzania, they were repatriated back to Burundi.

00:28:31 Speaker 2

They couldn't get access to land, they moved to the city, they moved to the Congo, the war, and they moved back to Burundi, they moved to Rwanda.

00:28:37 Speaker 2

That's not resilience.

00:28:38 Speaker 2

That is trauma, that's endless trauma.

00:28:41 Speaker 2

And I just can't understand how people survive that type of trauma that is endless.

00:28:48 Speaker 2

And so, yeah, there are ways in which people adapt because we have an impetus to survive.

00:28:54 Speaker 2

But these are often traditional ways in which people have dealt with strangers.

00:28:59 Speaker 2

Prior to the war, prior to modernity, often, people go back to how their communities have dealt with crises.

00:29:08 Speaker 2

I think for me, one of the wonderful things about societies in Africa, despite everything, strangers are often welcome.

00:29:16 Speaker 2

They extend their hand to strangers.

00:29:19 Speaker 2

And what I've noticed in recent years, because of the international community, because of this international emphasis on controlling migration, on controlling aliens, controlling immigration and so on, that people in border regions have been told and been pressurized to think of strangers crossing from other countries as threats, as dangerous, as people who don't have the right to belong, who don't have the right to cross a border.

00:29:48 Speaker 2

These are artificial borders, if you remember.

00:29:50 Speaker 2

These are often borders in Africa anyway, put in by colonial powers.

00:29:53 Speaker 2

But the whole emphasis on stopping migration and controlling migration in the West.

00:29:58 Speaker 2

has meant that funds have been provided to African governments to strengthen their borders, to stop people from being hospitable to strangers.

00:30:07 Speaker 2

That, for me, is very, very concerning in terms of our resilience and survival, because I think we rely on strangers in many places in the world, even in the global North.

00:30:19 Speaker 2

We rely sometimes on the benevolence of strangers.

00:30:23 Speaker 2

That's how we manage to interact with people, whether it's on the bus, on the streets, and so on.

00:30:29 Speaker 2

There's a certain degree of empathy or recognition that that stranger is not necessarily going to harm me.

00:30:35 Speaker 2

But what's been promoted now, I think, in African countries and in border regions is that the stranger is a terrorist.

00:30:41 Speaker 2

The stranger is going to cause harm.

00:30:43 Speaker 2

And for me, that is very, very worrying.

00:30:45 Speaker 2

So I'm very much against a lot of these policies that the EU and other Western countries are pushing in Africa with regards to controlled borders.

00:30:55 Speaker 2

because they're creating anxiety and animosity between people who should be hospitable to each other, and it goes against African traditions.

00:31:03 Speaker 1

I really agree with you about resilience, that somehow it can be very dehumanizing.

00:31:08 Speaker 1

It doesn't make the full range of human emotions visible.

00:31:13 Speaker 1

I think it's a very difficult and complex thing, because these words which are intended to demonstrate that people live not only in ways that are passive and as victims,

00:31:25 Speaker 1

can also be used to stop others from getting resources.

00:31:30 Speaker 1

You say, Well, they don't need it because they're inherently strong.

00:31:32 Speaker 1

They've been used to enduring.

00:31:34 Speaker 1

So when we think about the ways in which resilience can be used in a negative way, I think sometimes it doesn't allow us to think about how people draw on resources to adapt and endure.

00:31:48 Speaker 1

So I think there is something interesting about how these words can be used in positive and negative ways.

00:31:55 Speaker 1

And what you were saying before about how the word resilience is used to actually stop people from getting resources, because it says, well, you don't need anything because you've had generations of these problems and you've found a way, you know?

00:32:07 Speaker 1

And I think what you're saying is we want to live in a world where people don't have to try and think about these strategies and that they are afforded the same dignity and grace as people everywhere in the world.

00:32:19 Speaker 1

Ricardo, I'd be really interested in hearing your perspective on this.

00:32:24 Speaker 3

Thinking about human rights and international human rights law, it is recognized that there are two dimensions.

00:32:33 Speaker 3

There is the dimension of what we tend to call obligation of means, so due diligence obligations, showing that a state is doing the most it can do to protect and fulfill the rights.

00:32:48 Speaker 3

But then at the same time, there is a dimension of what is called the obligation of results, of goals, of reaching a specific end.

00:32:56 Speaker 3

There is a lot of philosophical debate about the relation between the means and the ends.

00:33:01 Speaker 3

Thinking about what Patricia was saying about resilience, we should never forget the two dimensions.

00:33:08 Speaker 3

There is definitely something we can do in a moment of crisis, in a moment of emergency.

00:33:14 Speaker 3

Because of the humanitarian imperative, we are committed to protect life, even in the darkest hours of a conflict or a natural disaster.

00:33:22 Speaker 3

But at the same time, we need always to keep in mind that there is an end goal, and the end goal is fixed in human rights treaties, in international instruments, like the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Covenant on Human Rights, and all the human rights treaties, as well as other international conventions.

00:33:43 Speaker 3

When Patricia was speaking, I was thinking about an important concept in the broader sector where I work, the concept of triple nexus that connects the humanitarian interventions with development in terms not only economic development and human development, as well as peacebuilding.

00:34:00 Speaker 3

I like the idea that these three components are connected

00:34:05 Speaker 3

In the reality on the ground, we are seeing that, sadly, there is not always a clear-cut end of when the humanitarian intervention finishes and when we have the development of the peace-building beginning.

00:34:19 Speaker 3

It depends on many different variables, and it's also good to have this sort of flexibility in terms of what we were saying earlier, that people and communities have to exercise their own self-determination and decide what is a danger, what requires development, or what peace could be.

00:34:38 Speaker 3

I'd like to follow up on a point that Patricia Daly was making.

00:34:42 Speaker 3

I see that point of how resilience might run the risk of being used as depriving people of the agency.

00:34:51 Speaker 3

The resilient people basically just have to deal with the specific risk and carry on.

00:34:57 Speaker 3

We have a very interesting anniversary this year with the adoption of the Women, Peace and Security Agenda, the importance of recognizing the agency of women in all the peacebuilding, conflict prevention and reconstruction and reparation.

00:35:11 Speaker 3

In all the countries where MAG works and in all our programs,

00:35:16 Speaker 3

We have incredible examples of how women, in particular, decide to break cliches and taboos.

00:35:24 Speaker 3

They decide to be trained as deminers, and then they climb the ladder and they become technical experts and they are actively involved in positive peace building.

00:35:34 Speaker 3

And they see that as a way of responding to the conflict and create their own conclusion of the conflict.

00:35:41 Speaker 3

Another point that I see in my work every day

00:35:46 Speaker 3

Treaties like the Ottawa Convention, the Mine Ban Treaty, and the Convention on Cluster Munitions clearly say, in both treaties is at Article 6 on international cooperation, that contamination from explosive ordinance, it's not only a problem of the state that happened to have the explosive ordinance on its territory, it is a global issue that needs to be addressed globally.

00:36:09 Speaker 3

And it requires commitment by the whole community of states that ratified that treaty.

00:36:14 Speaker 3

At the same time, these efforts to create international cooperation in many cases are built on the expertise developed by the people of affected states.

00:36:26 Speaker 3

And we are seeing beautiful examples of South to South cooperation where the expertise of countries that have addressed explosive ordinance contamination is being lent to

00:36:39 Speaker 3

another country that has recently experienced the same problem.

00:36:43 Speaker 3

So an important thing that for me connects the process to the end is the fact that in the middle you have those people who adapted and developed expertise and they see a sort of unity with other communities around the world with the same problem.

00:37:01 Speaker 3

There is a form of unity created out of a common concern and common issue.

00:37:07 Speaker 3

And this is very nice to see when it happens.

00:37:09 Speaker 3

It's not well publicized sometimes, but it happens on the ground and the international level, regional level.

00:37:16 Speaker 1

Thank you so much, Garda.

00:37:17 Speaker 1

So many similarities and points resonate between you and Patricia.

00:37:21 Speaker 1

I think it makes sense for us to think about wrapping up now, but it'd be really great to hear from you about your reflections on the workshop and how it made you think about your work differently or what were some of the key messages you were left with.

00:37:37 Speaker 1

Kusha.

00:37:37 Speaker 2

I suppose what struck me was the fact that we were coming from different fields, different empirical contexts, but we were all struggling with this notion of ending.

00:37:50 Speaker 2

And there was no clear fixed point for something to end, whether it's a health crisis or a war.

00:37:58 Speaker 2

people had to define the parameters of what constitutes the end.

00:38:02 Speaker 2

And even then, things can linger.

00:38:05 Speaker 2

So I found the commonalities between what we were studying, even though we were coming from different disciplines and different contexts, really interesting.

00:38:15 Speaker 1

Thank you very much, Ricardo.

00:38:17 Speaker 3

It was interesting to see both the diversity as well as the commonalities, and it was a great exercise to think in an interdisciplinary way, even transdisciplinary.

00:38:29 Speaker 3

I hope that the project will go towards that direction.

00:38:32 Speaker 3

One thing that remained in my mind and still is in my mind

00:38:37 Speaker 3

is that one of these diversities among us, and commonalities as well, is the fact that we can clearly see that there are some phenomena that cannot be controlled, and they don't maybe allow an end, or they require adaptation, like for example, climate change.

00:38:54 Speaker 3

But at the same time, this reminds us that there are especially human phenomena like war, like conflict, like explosive ordinance contamination that are pretty much controllable.

00:39:06 Speaker 3

They are created by humans and they can be solved by humans.

00:39:09 Speaker 3

And I think this was an important takeaway from me because this also conditions when we can say that something has ended and when we just need to find new endings or adapt.

00:39:22 Speaker 1

That's great.

00:39:22 Speaker 1

Thank you so much, Patricia.

00:39:24 Speaker 2

What's interesting is that perhaps it's a human aspiration.

00:39:29 Speaker 2

We want conclusion, don't we?

00:39:31 Speaker 2

want an end to something.

00:39:33 Speaker 2

And perhaps we have to live with the idea that ends don't necessarily happen.

00:39:38 Speaker 2

We want to package life's trajectories and events into an order, and we want to see terrible things concluded.

00:39:47 Speaker 2

But I think all the research suggests they linger and sometimes we can't control the end at all.

00:39:52 Speaker 2

And then I suppose the issue is how do we live with that?

00:39:56 Speaker 2

What can we do to allow us to live with that?

00:40:00 Speaker 2

things that we can't really control.

00:40:02 Speaker 2

And climate change is human induced, but it's gone to the extent now that we can't actually control it to any great extent.

00:40:09 Speaker 2

So when do we intervene?

00:40:11 Speaker 2

Do we intervene much earlier in a pandemic?

00:40:13 Speaker 2

It's all that preparation that matters.

00:40:16 Speaker 2

Yeah, it threw up a lot of ideas about the nicety of endings.

00:40:21 Speaker 1

That brings us to the end of this podcast.

00:40:24 Speaker 1

Thank you for listening.

00:40:25 Speaker 1

Do join us next time when we hear from Bobby Farsidis, former professor of clinical and biomedical ethics at Brighton and Sussex Medical School, on ethics and endings in the context of the infected blood inquiry.

00:40:38 Speaker 1

I'm Patricia Kingouri, and you've been listening to After the End, brought to you by the Ethoc Centre at the University of Oxford, funded by the Wellcome Discovery Award Scheme.

00:40:49 Speaker 1

Please share this episode on and subscribe to the series wherever you get your podcasts.

00:40:54 Speaker 1

You can find more information about the After the End project on our website at www.aftertheend.squarespace.com.